

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY.

(but not taken up.)

Munsiff-Magistrate's Court for Arsikere.

Q.—443. Sri K. PANCHAKSHA-
RAH (Arsikere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) when the Report of Justice Mallappa Committee was submitted to them with regard to the reorganisation of courts in the State;

(b) the steps taken by them in respect of the said Report;

(c) whether they have considered the sanction of a Munsiff-Magistrate's Court to Arsikere?

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA
RAO (Minister for Law and Educa-
tion).—

(a) 31st January 1955.

(b) and (c) The views of the High Court of Mysore on the recommendations of the Committee have been called for. On a review of the jurisdiction of Courts in Hassan District, the High Court of Mysore have stated that apart from making the Court of the Additional First Class Magistrate, Hassan, permanent with jurisdiction over the Taluks of Belur and Saklespur and designating it as Second Magistrate's Court, Hassan, there does not appear to be any necessity at present to make any other change in the jurisdiction of Courts in Hassan District.

Unparliamentary expressions during question hours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—During question hour yesterday the Hon'ble Member Sri N. C. Nagaiah Reddy in putting a supplementary desired to know whether recommendation for a particular job was confined to a 'henchman' of the Government. He also used certain other words which were highly unparliamentary. Objection was taken to the use of this word 'henchman' as

well as to the use of the other unparliamentary words, which I directed yesterday should be expunged from the proceedings. So far as the word 'henchman' is concerned, I am now of the view that in the context in which it was used yesterday, it carries an insinuation and that therefore it is unparliamentary.

I want to take this opportunity to invite the attention of Hon'ble Members to the provisions of rule 26 which relate to the admissibility of questions. The same provisions apply to supplementaries also. By putting supplementaries which carry an insinuation or imputation or is otherwise inadmissible under the rules, the member loses his valuable right of getting information from the Government on points for which he wants elucidation. In other words, by putting an improper and inadmissible supplementary the loss is purely that of the Hon'ble Member.

A question is strictly intended to elicit information and a supplementary is intended to further elucidate any matter of fact regarding which an answer has been given. If Hon'ble Members will confine themselves to putting questions which genuinely seek information on matters of fact, not only would the number of supplementaries be considerably reduced but much heat would not be generated during question hour. A question which contains insinuations or arguments or ironical expressions or defamatory statements is clearly inadmissible and members cannot be expected to receive an answer for such questions. If the attention of the Chair is drawn to the fact that a supplementary infringes the rules, the Chair is always prepared to rule out that supplementary as not in order and that it need not be answered. I expect that Hon'ble Ministers will follow the procedure I have indicated and when they think that a supplementary carries an insinuation or an imputation or is inadmissible, the Minister will draw the attention of the Chair and wait for a ruling from the Chair as to whether the supplementary is inadmissible or has to be answered.